

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, as presently amended and in light of the following discussion, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-14 are currently pending. Claims 1-5, 9, and 13 have been amended; and Claim 14 has been added by the present amendment. The changes and additions to the claims are supported by the originally filed specification and do not add new matter.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claims 1-5 and 9 were under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,757,714 to Hansen (hereinafter “the ‘714 patent”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,772,143 to Hung (hereinafter “the ‘143 patent”) and U.S. Patent No. 6,711,624 to Narurkar et al. (hereinafter “the ‘624 patent”); and Claims 6-8 and 10-12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the ‘714, ‘143, and ‘624 patents, further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,826,023 to Hall et al. (hereinafter “the ‘023 patent”); and Claim 13 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the ‘714, ‘143, and ‘624 patents, further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,192,282 to Smith et al. (hereinafter “the ‘282 patent”).

Amended Claim 1 is directed to a method of receiving information concerning a remotely monitored device, information being contained in a message that also includes a message type designation, the method comprising: (1) parsing a first line from the message to extract the message type designation; (2) determining a data structure type based on the message type designation; (3) creating a data structure of the determined data structure type in a memory; (4) parsing a second line from the message to extract a data type and a data value; and (5) storing the extracted data value in the data structure of the determined data structure type at a location in the memory corresponding to the extracted data type. The

changes to the claims are supported by the originally filed specification and do not add new matter.¹

Regarding the rejection of Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 103, the Office Action asserts that the ‘714 patent discloses everything in Claim 1 with the exception of determining a data structure type and storing the read data elements in the data structure, and relies on the ‘143 and ‘624 patents to remedy those deficiencies.

Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of the Claim 1 (and dependent Claim 2) under 35 U.S.C. § 103 is rendered moot by the present amendment to Claim 1.

The ‘714 patent is directed to a system in which a device is embedded in an apparatus such that the embedded device detects the state of the apparatus and generates an electronic mail message that reports the state of the apparatus to a remote computer. The ‘714 patent discloses that the remote computer receives the electronic mail message and extracts the state of the embedded device from the message. Further, the ‘714 patent discloses that an XML parser 45 parses XML code in the received e-mail to extract variable values by recognizing field names such as “name” and “value” to extract the corresponding state variable values from those fields.² However, Applicants respectfully submit that the ‘714 patent fails to disclose determining a data structure type based on the message type designation, creating a data structure of the determined data structure type in a memory, and storing the extracted data value in the data structure of the determined data structure type at a location in the memory corresponding to an extracted data type, as recited in amended Claim 1.

The ‘143 patent is directed to a method and system for managing messages received on a machine, including automatically determining a value of a predetermined parameter of the message, automatically creating a folder for holding messages that match the value, and

¹ See, e.g., Fig. 15A, paragraph 119, and Tables 1-5 of the specification.

² See ‘714 patent, col. 6, lines 43-51.

automatically storing the message in the folder. For example, the ‘143 patent discloses that if the machine receives an MP3 song whose “artist” parameter indicates that the song is a Beatles song, the machine will automatically store the song in a folder designated for Beatles’ songs. However, Applicants respectfully submit that the ‘143 patent fails to disclose the steps of determining a data structure type based on a message type designation, parsing a line from a message to extract a data type and a data value, and storing the extracted data value in a data structure of a determined data structure type at a location in the memory corresponding to the extracted data type. Rather, the ‘143 patent merely discloses that an entire message is stored in a folder and does not disclose that a data value is stored at a location in memory corresponding to an extracted data type, as recited in amended Claim 1.

The ‘624 patent is directed to a method of dynamically loading driver interface modules for exchanging data between data hosts. The ‘624 patent discloses that the method includes transferring a data block from a source host having an internal source data format to a designation host having an internal destination format different from the source data format. Thus, the ‘624 patent discloses storing data in a table, as shown in Fig. 10A, and parsing data received from a source host, as shown in Fig. 11A. However, Applicants respectfully submit that the ‘624 patent fails to disclose the step of determining a data structure type based on a message type designation, creating a data structure of the determined data structure type in a memory, and storing extracted data values in the data structure of the determined data structure type at a location in the memory corresponding to the extracted data type, as recited in amended Claim 1. The ‘624 patent is silent regarding the determination of a data structure type based on a message type designation, and storing data values in a data structure of the determined data structure type, as recited in amended Claim 1.

Thus, no matter how the teachings of the ‘714, ‘143, and ‘624 patents are combined, the combination does not teach or suggest the determining and storing steps recited in

amended Claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 1 (and dependent Claim 2) patentably defines over any proper combination of the ‘714, ‘143, and ‘624 patents.

Independent Claims 3, 5, and 9 recite limitations analogous to the limitations recited in Claim 1. Moreover, Claims 3, 5, and 9 have been amended in a manner analogous to the amendment to Claim 1. Accordingly, for the reasons stated above for the patentability of Claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejections of Claims 3, 5, and 9 (and all similar rejected dependent claims) are rendered moot by the present amendment to independent Claims 3, 5, and 9.

Regarding the rejection of dependent Claims 6-8 and 10-13 under 35 U.S.C. § 103, Applicants respectfully submit that the ‘023 and ‘282 patents fails to remedy the deficiencies of the ‘714, ‘143, and ‘624 patents, as discussed above. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejections of Claims 6-8 and 10-13 are rendered moot by the present amendment to the independent claims.

The present amendment also sets forth new Claim 14 for examination on the merits. New Claim 14, which depends from Claim 1, recites that the message is transmitted over the Internet using an Internet e-mail protocol. Claim 14 is supported by the originally filed specification and does not add new matter.³ Moreover, based on the asserted allowability of Claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that new Claim 14 patentably defines over the cited references.

Thus, it is respectfully submitted that independent Claims 1, 3, 5, and 9 (and all associated dependent claims) patentably define over any proper combination of the ‘714, ‘143, ‘624, ‘023, and ‘282 patents.

³ See, e.g., Figure 9 and the discussion related thereto in the specification.

Consequently, in view of the present amendment and in light of the above discussion, the outstanding grounds for rejection are believed to have been overcome. The application as amended herewith is believed to be in condition for formal allowance. An early and favorable action to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

Kurt M. Berger

James J. Kulbaski
Registration No. 34,648
Attorney of Record
Kurt M. Berger, Ph.D.
Registration No. 51,461

Customer Number

22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 06/04)

JJK/KMB/law
I:\ATTY\KMB\205\S\205850US\205850US-AF.DOC